

PSJ4 SOL Opp Exh 41

Message

From: Emma, Douglas [/O=CAH/OU=CARDINAL HEALTH/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DOUGLAS.EMMA]
Sent: 4/12/2013 5:33:01 PM
To: Forst, Christopher [/O=CAH/OU=Cardinal Health/cn=Recipients/cn=Christopher.Forst]; Cameron, Todd [/O=CAH/OU=Cardinal Health/cn=Recipients/cn=Todd.Cameron]
CC: Anna-Soisson, Kimberly [/O=CAH/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Kimberly.anna-soisson]; Ng, Janet [/O=CAH/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Janet.ng]; Brady, William [/O=CAH/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Brady, William8ac]
Subject: RE: Just a thought

Chris/Todd,

My approach is to review the entire order by line item to determine whether the one item is possibly a newly formulated product, new launch, item not stocked by warehouse, supply chain issue, seasonal variation or a historical review supports the amount being ordered. When it gets to this point, I have no control on how the account got there and my decision is based using my professional judgment on a case by case basis. Otherwise the number is the number and if the account is ordering an item outside their normal pattern the order is cut and reported.

Since we no longer monitor threshold events for that book of business and not fully aware of the training guidelines given the CC team this apparent deficiency may need to be reviewed to solidify our process. In Kimberly's scenario she makes some very important points which may require a second level review or some type of escalation process to close the loop rather than relying solely on analytics.

Doug

Doug Emma, RPh
Manager Supply Chain Integrity
Quality & Regulatory Affairs
Cardinal Health | 7601 NE Gardner Ave
Kansas City, MO 64120
direct: 816-242-6122 fax: 614-652-4253

From: Brady, William
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 10:20 AM
To: Forst, Christopher; Cameron, Todd
Cc: Anna-Soisson, Kimberly; Emma, Douglas; Ng, Janet
Subject: RE: Just a thought

Chris,

In situations such as the one described, perhaps in scenarios such as the case outlined below, the ability to release a once/accrual order should be restricted after a certain number of releases.

Thanks,

William J Brady, RPH.
Manager, Supply Chain Integrity
and Regulatory Operations
Cardinal Health
william.brady@cardinalhealth.com

From: Forst, Christopher
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Cameron, Todd
Cc: Anna-Soisson, Kimberly; Brady, William; Emma, Douglas; Ng, Janet
Subject: RE: Just a thought

Todd,

I agree with Kimberly, I don't see these scenarios as much as the other pharmacists since they do the bulk of the reviews but it does seem like we need to address this issue from an "optics" standpoint. Other pharmacists what do you think?

Chris

Christopher J. Forst, BSPHA, MPA, FAPHA
Director, Supply Chain Integrity and Regulatory Operations

From: Anna-Soisson, Kimberly
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 10:31 AM
To: Cameron, Todd; Forst, Christopher
Subject: Just a thought

Todd/Chris:

Good morning. A few recent events suggest that we may need to consider adding or adjusting our process *or* the process exists and I am missing the process whereby we close the loop. We know that the CC team does a great job of utilizing the objective/subjective criteria to go through the process of increasing thresholds in a way that is consistent. If a customer is eligible for a TH increase a sales and/or QRA site visit is ordered if necessary by protocol based on visit history, DF, and zone. We also know that if the customer presents no *new* information that their TH is not considered for an increase and the TH remains the same. The analyst is allowed to release a % over that TH once per accrual period, even if an increase to TH isn't warranted, and, even if the customer is failing.

However, our policy is deficient in outlining what they should do *after a series* of SOM TH events whereby the customer is not due for an increase *and* is failing.

Example, you have a customer who consistently fails (i.e. score of 30), retail independent or chain, nothing suggests that they are due for an increase so the analyst [REDACTED] and moves on to the next customer. Wash, rinse, repeat. Meanwhile, the customer has effectively maxed out nearly every CS category, and contains subjective file notes that indicate they are not performing due diligence, etc.....

I believe that we need to outline a process for further review to close the loop once a customer "Fails" *multiple* times. Otherwise we are identifying and documenting a problem in a consistent manner, then exiting stage right.

-K

Kimberly S. Anna-Soisson, PharmD, NP
Manager Supply Chain Integrity
Quality & Regulatory Affairs
Cardinal Health
Ft. Myers, FL
(847)-887-5528